

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 \* \* \*

9 MAURICE DANIEL JAMES TALLEY,

Case No. 2:16-cv-00957-APG-VCF

10 Petitioner,

**ORDER**

11 v.

12 D.W. NEVENS, et al.,

13 Respondents.

14 Before the court is a *pro se* petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28  
15 U.S.C. § 2254, submitted by Maurice Daniel James Talley, a Nevada state prisoner  
16 (ECF Nos. 1, 1-1). He has paid the filing fee (see ECF No. 1-2), and therefore, his  
17 application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 3) shall be denied as moot. The  
18 court has reviewed the petition pursuant to Habeas Rule 4, and it shall be docketed and  
19 served on respondents.

20 A petition for federal habeas corpus should include all claims for relief of which  
21 petitioner is aware. If petitioner fails to include such a claim in his petition, he may be  
22 forever barred from seeking federal habeas relief upon that claim. See 28 U.S.C.  
23 §2254(b) (successive petitions). If petitioner is aware of any claim not included in his  
24 petition, he should notify the court of that as soon as possible, perhaps by means of a  
25 motion to amend his petition to add the claim.

26 Petitioner has also filed a motion for appointment of counsel and for discovery  
27 (docketed as two motions at ECF Nos. 2 and 8). There is no constitutional right to  
28 appointed counsel for a federal habeas corpus proceeding. *Pennsylvania v. Finley*, 481

1 U.S. 551, 555 (1987); *Bonin v. Vasquez*, 999 F.2d 425, 428 (9th Cir.1993). The  
2 decision to appoint counsel is generally discretionary. *Chaney v. Lewis*, 801 F.2d 1191,  
3 1196 (9th Cir.1986), cert. denied, 481 U.S. 1023 (1987); *Bashor v. Risley*, 730 F.2d  
4 1228, 1234 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 838 (1984). However, counsel must be  
5 appointed if the complexities of the case are such that denial of counsel would amount  
6 to a denial of due process, and where the petitioner is a person of such limited  
7 education as to be incapable of fairly presenting his claims. See *Chaney*, 801 F.2d at  
8 1196; see also *Hawkins v. Bennett*, 423 F.2d 948 (8th Cir.1970). Here, Talley's petition  
9 appears sufficiently clear in presenting the issues that he wishes to raise, and the legal  
10 issues are not particularly complex. Therefore, counsel is not justified.

11 Further, Talley's motion for discovery shall be denied without prejudice at this  
12 time. Rule 5 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases directs that respondents shall attach  
13 the relevant state-court records to their responsive pleading. Talley may file a motion  
14 for discovery if respondents fail to comply with Rule 5. Talley also filed a motion for  
15 evidentiary hearing on July 5, 2016 (ECF No. 4), and he filed a duplicate motion on  
16 August 15, 2016 (ECF No. 9). For the same reason, Talley's motions for an evidentiary  
17 hearing, as well as his motion to compel (ECF No. 5) are all denied without prejudice.

18 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Clerk **shall ELECTRONICALLY SERVE**  
19 the petition (ECF Nos. 1, 1-1) on the respondents.

20 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall add Adam Paul Laxalt, Nevada  
21 Attorney General, as counsel for respondents.

22 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that respondents shall file a response to the petition,  
23 including potentially by motion to dismiss, within **ninety (90) days** of service of the  
24 petition, with any requests for relief by petitioner by motion otherwise being subject to  
25 the normal briefing schedule under the local rules. Any response filed shall comply with  
26 the remaining provisions below, which are entered pursuant to Habeas Rule 5.  
27  
28

1           **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that any procedural defenses raised by respondents  
2 in this case shall be raised together in a single consolidated motion to dismiss. In other  
3 words, the court does not wish to address any procedural defenses raised herein either  
4 *in seriatum* fashion in multiple successive motions to dismiss or embedded in the  
5 answer. Procedural defenses omitted from such motion to dismiss will be subject to  
6 potential waiver. Respondents shall not file a response in this case that consolidates  
7 their procedural defenses, if any, with their response on the merits, except pursuant to  
8 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(2) as to any unexhausted claims clearly lacking merit. If  
9 respondents do seek dismissal of unexhausted claims under § 2254(b)(2): (a) they shall  
10 do so within the single motion to dismiss not in the answer; and (b) they shall  
11 specifically direct their argument to the standard for dismissal under § 2254(b)(2) set  
12 forth in *Cassett v. Stewart*, 406 F.3d 614, 623-24 (9th Cir. 2005). In short, no  
13 procedural defenses, including exhaustion, shall be included with the merits in an  
14 answer. All procedural defenses, including exhaustion, instead must be raised by  
15 motion to dismiss.

16           **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, in any answer filed on the merits, respondents  
17 shall specifically cite to and address the applicable state court written decision and state  
18 court record materials, if any, regarding each claim within the response as to that claim.

19           **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that petitioner shall have **forty-five (45) days** from  
20 service of the answer, motion to dismiss, or other response to file a reply or opposition,  
21 with any other requests for relief by respondents by motion otherwise being subject to  
22 the normal briefing schedule under the local rules.

23           **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that any additional state court record exhibits filed  
24 herein by either petitioner or respondents shall be filed with a separate index of exhibits  
25 identifying the exhibits by number. The CM/ECF attachments that are filed further shall  
26 be identified by the number of the exhibit in the attachment.  
27  
28

1           **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that any additional state court record exhibits filed  
2 herein by either petitioner or respondents shall be filed with a separate index of exhibits  
3 identifying the exhibits by number. The CM/ECF attachments that are filed further shall  
4 be identified by the number or numbers of the exhibits in the attachment. The hard  
5 copy of any additional state court record exhibits shall be forwarded – for this case – to  
6 the Clerk’s Office, 400 S. Virginia St., Reno, NV, 89501 and directed to “Staff Attorney.”

7           **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that petitioner’s application to proceed *in forma*  
8 *pauperis* (ECF No. 3) is **DENIED** as moot.

9           **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that petitioner’s motion for appointment of counsel  
10 and motion for discovery (docketed as two motions at ECF Nos. 2 and 8); two motions  
11 for evidentiary hearing (ECF Nos. 4 and 9); and motion to compel (ECF No. 5) are all  
12 **DENIED** without prejudice.

13           DATED: 6 October 2016.

14             
15           \_\_\_\_\_  
16           ANDREW P. GORDON  
17           UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28